[30th January 1956

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : In the case of Dhanalakshmi Weaving Works, Kakkat, the two workers reported for duty on 21st December 1955 and absented themselves from work thereafter. In the case of Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, the two workers did not report for duty on or before 22nd December 1953, and therefore there was no contravention of the order of the Labour Appellate Tribunal. In the case of Ranganatha Weaving Mills, Achoor, five workers did not want reinstatement and three workers who were re-employed by the management in September 1954 left the factory in November 1954.

Compensation payable to the two workers in Dhanalakshmi Weaving Works and seven workers in Ranganatha Weaving Works have been settled by the Labour Officer. The other workers have not come forward to claim compensation.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : May I know whether the management of the Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills have implemented the Award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal, whether they have taken back the two workers and have given also compensation to them?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Labour Officer has asked the Union to advise the workers of the Rajeswari Mills to put in their claims for compensation for the period of employment prior to the award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal less the amounts earned during that period. On putting their claims, further action will be taken.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : When a management opposes or fails to implement the provisions of an award, there is provision in the Industrial Disputes Act—Section 29—to take action against that management. When the highest Tribunal gives a verdict and if that verdict is not respected by the management, why not the Government take action under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act against the erring management? If this is not done, managements will never respect the existing laws. I wish to know why the Government have not taken action so far against the management?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Government do not fail to take action against any management whenever they see that an award is not implemented. But in this case the Government do not see that there is any non-implementation of the award.

* 3080 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have received any representation recently from the President, Cotton Mill Workers' Union, Thiruvanoor, Kallai, Malabar, to refer the dispute between the workers and the management of the above mills regarding the bonus for 1952–53 for arbitration; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken thereon?

30th January 1956]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) The Government declined to refer the dispute for adjudication as the company incurred loss in 1952 and as there was no surplus available in 1953 for distribution as bonus.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Before a dispute is referred for adjudication, it is sent to the Labour Officer and then the matter is sent to Government for deciding whether it should be referred for adjudication or not. This process takes a lot of time. So, why not the Government make it a policy to refer all disputes raised by labour unions for adjudication? Will the Government consider this question sympathetically and refer all industrial disputes for adjudication?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : While the Government are sympathetic in this matter, the Government do not agree with the view that all industrial disputes should invariably be referred for adjudication. The Government have a discretion in the matter and they have to exercise that discretion before they decide on referring a dispute for adjudication.

* 3081 *Q.*—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state— 9-30 a.m.

(*a*) whether the Government have received a memorandum, dated 4th February 1955, from the Secretary, Malabar Plantation Group of Malabar Trade Union Congress, regarding the dispute between the plantation owners and workers in Malabar on the question of bonus for the year 1954; and

(*b*) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) The Assistant Commissioner of Labour conducted conciliation proceedings in the matter on 5th August 1955 and 5th December 1955. The parties have come to an agreement on the issue of bonus for the year 1954 for the workers and the staff in the plantation estates of this State.

* 3082 *Q.*—SRI C. KANDASAMY (on behalf of Sri N. K. Palanisamy) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there was an agreement between the management of the Kadri Mills, Coimbatore, and the workers on 27th August 1954 that third shift workers of the mills would be made permanent;

(*b*) if so, whether it is a fact that the agreement was violated on 7th March 1955 by the management; and

(*c*) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) & (*c*) The management have implemented the agreement substantially by making 70 workers permanent; but they have violated the latter part of clause 2 of the agreement, in so far as they